

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/723,459

Applicant(s)
Menon et al.

Examiner
Clinton Ostrup

Group Art Unit
1619

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

#6

(1) Clinton Ostrup

(3) Diana Dudash

(2) Charles Ruggiero

(4) _____

Date of Interview Oct 24, 2001

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-25

Identification of prior art discussed:

Yes, all cited references

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The prior art cited was discussed and new improved translations of the Japanese references were given to applicant's representative. Depending on what the new translation recites and the amount of extracts disclosed, the examiner will reconsider the rejections in view of any amendment, especially to the composition claims. Mr. Ruggiero argued that the primary references are directed to hair growth and not to improvement of the appearance of skin or hair and that the method claims appear to be allowable over the prior art. The examiner urges that the word "preventing" in claims 14, 15 and 17 be replaced with treating in order to move claims closer to allowable condition. Claim 15, directed to ameliorating the effects of aging on skin is clearly not covered by the primary references and appears to be allowable subject to further consideration and an updated search.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.